

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of April 10, 2013

Members Present: Hillary Cole, Nan Chase, Brian Cook, Capi Wampler, David Carpenter, Pat Cothran, David Nutter, Tracey Rizzo, Brendan Ross

Members Absent: J. Ray Elingburg, Jo Stephenson

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Tom Bailey, Mark Marshall, Rhett Mays, Joseph Kitt, Alan Glines

Call to Order: Chair Cole calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Commissioner Nutter moves to adopt the March 13, 2013 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

1. Owner/Applicant: Rhett Mays & Stephanie Presenza
Subject Property: 20 Watauga St.
Hearing Date: April 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639.94-6268
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – proposed site plan; Exhibit A – proposed changes, rear elevation; Exhibit C – proposed floor plan; Exhibit D – existing floor plan; Exhibit E – seven photographs of existing structure; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 27th day of March, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of March, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits F and G.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

HRC Minutes
April 10, 2013

3. That the application is to remove existing enclosed rear porch and replace with wood deck and attached wood stairs per attached plans. The new deck will span the back of the house and be 41' long. It will be 9' wide in the area of the existing enclosed porch and 4' wide adjacent to the kitchen bump out. The deck floor will be stained and the rails painted to match the house. Repair siding as necessary in area of existing rear porch upon removal and paint to match existing. Install new exterior storm windows painted to match the house. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Decks found on pages 38-39 and the Guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 12 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new deck will be set back behind the west elevation bump out to diminish public visibility.
 - b. The addition was not original to the house and is in poor condition.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| 2. Owner/Applicant: | Alan Glines |
| Subject Property: | 99 Pearson Dr. |
| Hearing Date: | April 10, 2013 |
| Historic District: | Montford |
| PIN: | 9649.03-3320 |
| Zoning District: | RM-8 |
| Other Permits: | Building |

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – survey showing sidewalk replacement area and garden project area; Exhibit B – tree removal and replacement

HRC Minutes
April 10, 2013

plan; Exhibit C – two photographs of house showing sidewalk repair area; Exhibit D – photograph of backyard marked with trees to be removed; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 27th day of March, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of March, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits E and F.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to replace deteriorated section of front walk with new concrete in the same configuration as existing. Remove walnut, cherry and maple from rear yard to make room for new garden space. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 41-42 and the Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new walkway will match the existing in material and configuration.
 - b. The Norway maple is invasive, the cherry is shading the garden space and the walnut inhibits the growth of other plants.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Gertrude Galynker
Subject Property: 38 Elizabeth Place/7 Woodlawn Ave.
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-7753
Zoning District: RS-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten explains the project was approved with a condition that the applicant submit additional details about the wall veneer. The information the applicant provided calls for an amendment instead. Continued items are not advertised, so notification was not sent to neighbors about an amendment. An amended application will have to be submitted if the applicant does not want to fulfill the conditions. Ms. Merten asks the Commissioners to revisit the site if the amendment is submitted, since work on the wall has begun. Attorney Ashley advises the Commissioners to treat it as a new application.
-----------------------	--

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Jeanette Syprazak
Subject Property: 41 Starnes Ave.
Hearing Date: *(continued from February 13, 2013)*
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-8325
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten explains the applicant has asked for a continuance to the May meeting.
-----------------------	---

Commission Action

MOTION TO CONTINUE

Motion by: Commissioner Chase
Second by: Commissioner Wampler
Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Southern Highland Craft Guild
Subject Property: 26 Lodge Street
Hearing Date: April 10, 2013
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9648.60-6313
Zoning District: CBII
Other Permits: Sign Permit

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten explains the application is only before the Commission because there are variations from the guidelines, in overall sign area total and in the number of signs. She says the applicant has submitted revised dimensions for one sign. She shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: The Biltmore Oteen Bank Building, constructed between 1925 and 1930 is a two story Georgian Revival structure. It is a thin wedge shaped structure which displays English bond brick work, concrete detail, Doric pilasters and other classical ornamentation.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Install two projecting entrance signs. Signs will be aluminum with vinyl lettering. Remove non original coach lights and emergency lighting and install LED sign lighting and emergency lights into sign bracket. Install 3.5' x 15.4' wall mounted sign on west elevation. Sign will be aluminum with vinyl lettering. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Two business identification signs are allowed per lot.2. Projecting signs shall be no more than 10 sq. ft. in Commercial Core Sub Area.3. Flush mounted signs shall be no more than 20 sq. ft. in Commercial Core Sub Area. <p>This structure has limited availability for adequate flush mounted signage to meet the guidelines due to the detailing. The side location does not obscure details and would provide needed visibility for this site which has faced challenges for business viability, being virtually vacant since the flood of 2004. Staff's opinion is that the larger sign is appropriate, considering its location on the side of the structure and the larger size of the structure compared to other buildings in the sub areas. Staff is also comfortable with the additional projecting sign on the front of the structure as it is congruent with the symmetrical classical character of the front façade.</p> <p>The Guidelines for Signs found in Chapter 6, Book 1, pages 35-42 of the <i>General Design Guidelines and Policies</i> of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines were used to evaluate this request.</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the proposed sign.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signs do not obscure character defining features or details. 2. The building is larger and different in character than others in the subarea. 3. Additional projecting sign is in keeping with classical/symmetrical character of front façade.
Applicant(s)	Tom Bailey, director of the Folk Art Center, explains the business will be similar to the Folk Art Center's, but on a smaller scale. He thinks the sign needs to be visible from the intersection of the hotel and the entrance to the Biltmore Estate, as well as to pedestrians. He says they do not want to do anything that will detract from the history of the building.

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Nutter asks how often signs are allowed high up on the sides of buildings. Commissioner Wampler says signs are reviewed on a case by case basis. Ms. Merten notes the guidelines allow this, and this location has particular challenges.

Commissioner Cook asks if there are definitions for a roof sign, since the one in question is on a side of the flat parapet roof. Ms. Merten says a roof definition has never come up before, and there is no definition in the guidelines, but the use of the term 'roof sign' is intended to describe something sticking up higher than the roof. She says this would be considered a flush-mount sign.

Commissioner Ross expresses concern about the visibility from Biltmore Station, says it looks out of place. Commissioner Carpenter agrees, asks for clarification of the dimensions, and suggests larger banners in the front, or perhaps a hanging banner from a window. Ms. Merten says these would detract from character defining features on the front of the building, and may cover them. Commissioner Chase says the location is the most visible, and thinks a larger banner would convey a carnival atmosphere. Chair Cole reads from the guidelines about obscuring building features, and notes the trees in front also pose a problem.

Commissioner Ross says the high sign would look like a billboard. Ms. Merten notes the revised dimensions may be helpful in that regard. Commissioner Carpenter suggests a reversal of the colors may help the sign blend into the building, and this would also help.

Mr. Bailey explains the new dimensions of the high sign would be 3'6" high by 14'6" wide. He says he would be glad to reverse the color scheme, using light letters on a dark background. Commissioner Carpenter says a more subdued background color would be preferable. Commissioner Nutter agrees.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – flexible development application; Exhibit B – color photograph of building with three proposed signs superimposed; Exhibit C – b&w photograph of entrance detailing proposed signs, sign brackets and

lighting plans; Exhibit D – architectural drawing of west elevation showing sign location, material and dimensions; Exhibit E – two sheets of sign light specifications; Exhibit F – revised sign dimensions (*submitted 4/10/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 27th day of March, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of March, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits G and H.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to install two projecting entrance signs. Signs will be aluminum with vinyl lettering. Remove non original coach lights and emergency lighting and install LED sign lighting and emergency lights into sign bracket. Install 3.5’ x 15.4’ wall mounted sign on west elevation. Sign will be aluminum with vinyl lettering. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the Guidelines for Signs found in Chapter 6, Book 1, pages 35-42 of the *General Design Guidelines and Policies* of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. Signs do not obscure character defining features or details.
 - b. The building is larger and different in character than others in the sub area.
 - c. Additional projecting sign is in keeping with classical/symmetrical character of front façade.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Nutter, Cole, Cook, Cothran, Rizzo, Carpenter and Chase

Vote against: Commissioner Ross

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following condition:

1. **Color change be submitted to staff for review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler
Second by: Commissioner Cook
Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Cook, Cole, Cothran, Rizzo, Carpenter, Chase and Nutter
Vote against: Commissioner Ross

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Rick & Pamela Hessdorfer/Mark Marshall
Subject Property: 5 Cullowhee St.
Hearing Date: April 10, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.03-5232
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten explains this is an amended application. She shows slides of the property and points out the proposed changes.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant lot from the subdivision and recombination of the two adjacent lots which front on Pearson and Montford Ave.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Amend previously issued CA to construct a new 2 story, 1,488 sq. ft. single family structure with recessed front porch per revised plans dated 3/20/13. Amendments include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Remove one set of double hung windows on southwestern elevation and replace with three casement windows. 2) Omit hip roof on master bedroom closet and extend roof line to meet new outside corners, replace windows on northeast elevation in master bedroom with three casement windows. 3) Remove center columns, brackets and handrails from front porch and replace with steps that span the porch. Remove small inset of porch so that window and door are on the same plane. 4) Add staircase from rear deck to backyard. 5) Add two vertical feet to main body of home and remove upper level window on the rear impacted by this change. 6) Excavate as necessary for walkout basement and add additional windows and doors per drawings. 7) Remove additional tree in front leaning towards future home. <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A landscape plan and roof color were conditions of the original CA. <p>The guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 and the Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The changes are in keeping with the guidelines.
Applicant(s)	Mark Marshall, contractor, shows the revised landscape plan and says he used pages 104 – 107 of the guidelines to choose plants and trees.

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Cole asks why there are no plantings on the right side of the house. Mr. Marshall says his clients want to have as much lawn space as possible. Commissioner Chase asks if the rhododendron will have enough shade, he says there are existing trees that will shade it.

Commissioner Carpenter expresses concern about the placement and choice of casement windows on the SW and the NE elevations. Mr. Marshall says the living room overlooks the driveway, so the windows were placed to improve the view and for better furniture placement. Ms. Merten reads three guidelines that pertain to window choice and placement. Commissioner Carpenter says they seem off balance, and he thinks furniture placement is not a problem and window treatments can provide privacy. Commissioner Chase says she is reluctant to impose a fiat that alters the usability of the interior. Chair Cole says buiding use is not within the HRC's purview. Commissioner Cook suggests moving the windows to center and balance the view from the outside. Discussion follows on other options for placement, and the importance of compatible fenestration. Chair Cole notes this is of particular concern because the driveway runs alongside this elevation, and there is no opportunity for screening. Commissioner Cothran sees reasons for the casement windows in other parts of the house, but in the case of the two elevations in question the large size of the wall makes the smaller casement windows look like they don't fit. She says it looks like a garage. Ms. Merten agrees, and thinks this is what makes it incompatible. Mr. Marshall says he is willing to discuss other window options with his clients.

Chair Cole asks for a discussion of the tree removal requests. Mr. Marshall says his clients want more livable exterior space, and they have concerns about the fruit from the black walnut tree affecting other plants. Chair Cole says replacement trees are required, Mr. Marshall says he could plant one on either side of the sidewalk. Ms. Merten notes the replacements should be large deciduous trees.

Mr. Marshall asks to amend his application to remove the replacement of one set of double hung windows on SW elevation with three casement windows.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – site plan and streetscape photographs with project superimposed; Exhibit C – first, second and basement floor plans; Exhibit D – front and rear perspective drawings; Exhibit E –

architect's renderings of southeast, northwest, northeast and southwest elevations; Exhibit F – description of plants (*submitted 4/10/13*); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 27th day of March, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of March, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits G and H.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to amend previously issued CA to construct a new 2 story, 1,488 sq. ft. single family structure with recessed front porch per revised plans dated 3/20/13. Amendments include:
 - 1) Omit hip roof on master bedroom closet and extend roof line to meet new outside corners, replace windows on northeast elevation in master bedroom with three casement windows.
 - 2) Remove center columns, brackets and handrails from front porch and replace with steps that span the porch. Remove small inset of porch so that window and door are on the same plane.
 - 3) Add staircase from rear deck to backyard.
 - 4) Add two vertical feet to main body of home and remove upper level window on the rear impacted by this change.
 - 5) Excavate as necessary for walkout basement and add additional windows and doors per drawings.
 - 6) Remove additional tree in front leaning towards future home.

All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.

4. That the guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 and the Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The changes are in keeping with the guidelines.
 - b. The replacements for the mature black walnut tree will maintain the streetscape pattern.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Wampler

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following conditions:

- 1. Revised landscape plan be submitted for staff review.**
- 2. Revised drawings showing double hung windows replacing the casement windows be submitted for staff review.**
- 3. Roof sample be submitted for staff review.**
- 4. Black walnut tree will be replaced with two large deciduous trees.**

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Terry Deal
Subject Property: 158 Cherokee Road
Hearing Date: April 10, 2013
Historic District: Albemarle Park
PIN: 9649.74-4658
Zoning District: RS-4
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten explains this is an after the fact situation, and notes the applicant is not at the meeting.</p> <p>Commissioner Wampler asks if this would be the time to consider a fine. Ms. Merten explains steps in the fine process, and says the applicant was charged a double fee as a penalty when she submitted this application.</p> <p>Discussion follows on whether a fee should be levied, or if the application should be continued. Ms. Merten says she is not sure the applicant knew she needed representation at the meeting. Attorney Ashley reads from the rules of procedure, and says since it is not clear whether the applicant was told she needed to be at the meeting, the application should be continued. Commissioner Chase suggests the applicant be sent a letter explaining that attendance is required at the next meeting, or she will face enforcement. Ms. Merten agrees.</p>
-----------------------	--

Commission Action

MOTION TO CONTINUE

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Carpenter

Vote for: Commissioners Nutter, Carpenter, Cole, Chase, Cothran, Cook, Rizzo and Ross

Vote against: Commissioner Wampler

Preliminary Review:

Owner/Applicant: Joseph Kitt
Subject Property: 139 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date: January 9, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.12-2492
Zoning District: RM-16
Other Permits: New Construction

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report. She says her only question is about any salvaged material, and how it may be incorporated into this design.</p> <p>Property Description: Original home was lost due to fire in December 2012, and recently demolished with approval from the HRC.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new home per attached plans and specifications.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>Will any material salvaged from the original structure be incorporated into the new house?</p> <p>The guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Review and provide applicant appropriate feedback.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Kevin Ward, contractor/designer with Southeast Ecological Design, offers to answer Commissioners' questions about the proposed design. He says they hope to submit for final review quickly. He says they will be able to reuse the front door of the original house, and the columns that were supporting the front porch roof (they will have to add additional columns). Some salvaged bricks and the heart pine flooring will be used for interior details.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Carpenter asks how the new design relates to the original house. Cole notes the applicants were not asked to consider the previous home in their design, during the building demolition review, per the guidelines. They were only asked to salvage materials if possible.

Commissioner Nutter asks if the Queen Anne style turret might be more vertical. Mr. Ward answers there are complications related to cost, and the turret's proximity to the dormer.

Commissioner Carpenter asks about the turret roof connection to the main roof, he thinks it

should be more separate, perhaps higher than the dormer. Commissioners Nutter and Cook agree. Mr. Ward says he will review that feature, and see if there is an affordable solution.

Chair Cole asks about the foundation material and the sidewalk plan. Mr. Ward says the front portion of the foundation will be brick, and brick will merge into stucco on the sides. He says they will probably propose concrete for the walkway, but if they have enough bricks they would like to include them. Owner Joseph Kitt says he thinks there will be enough.

Chair Cole says the windows seem too plain for the style of the house, if the applicant wants to use them, they should submit examples of other houses in Montford with similar styles using similar windows. Mr. Ward says the sizes of the windows have been increased on the first floor. Commissioner Carpenter asks about the siding on the 2nd floor. Mr. Ward says it will be cedar, with a 6" reveal.

Chair Cole reminds the applicants to provide a landscape plan, storyboard and material samples for the final review.

Other Business:

Sondley Award nominations. Ms. Merten says this year's award will be presented at the Preservation Society's Griffin Awards ceremony on May 30, location to be determined. She suggests two nominees, John Cram, and Jane and Rich Mathews as joint recipients. She asks for other suggestions. Commissioner Rizzo asks if professionals could be considered (yes), and suggests Jeff Futch of the SHPO. Ms. Merten says she could wait a week for other nominations, and then would need a vote within another week, to meet the time constraints and have the Sondley bowl engraved. She says this process could be done via email. Commissioner Chase asks for a short biographical description of each nominee, all agree this would be helpful.

Local Landmark concern. Ms. Merten reports she and Commissioner Carpenter met with the architects of the project proposed on East Chestnut Street next to the Patton/Parker House, a Local Landmark. She says the developers are reluctant to change the design, and have asked for a buffer reduction. They offered to plant more buffer on the Patton/Parker property, but this is not feasible as the driveway is located right at the property line. They offered to move the drive way, but this would not be allowed as it has historically been in that place. Ms. Merten suggests the Commission write a letter saying they are not in favor of a reduced buffer, and says the project will go to Planning and Zoning Commission in May. Commissioners all agree.

Montford accessory committee update. Ms. Merten says the committee is scheduled to meet on April 11, and she will report their progress at the May meeting.

Commissioner Wampler moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 5:59 pm.